UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,746	11/21/2003	Andreas Kemmler	6631P008	1795

		EXAMINER
7590	07/28/2005	HWANG, JOON H

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP
Suite 510
60 S. Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/718,746	KEMMLER, ANDREAS
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joon H. Hwang	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 May 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☒ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The applicants amended claims 1-3, 7, 10-13, 17, and 20 in the amendment

received on 5/11/05.

The claims 1-20 are pending.

Priority

2.   Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an

application filed in Germany on 10/15/2003. It is noted, however, that applicant has not

filed a certified copy of the 103 48 665.8 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Claim Objections

3.   Claims 1, 3, 7, 10, 11, 13, 17, and 20 are objected to because of the following

informalities:

Claim 11 recites in line 12, the limitation "the information" in "hence the

information" phrase, it is unclear whether it is the information about the data

object or the information about the registration.

"the respective application" in 3rd line of claim 11 should be "a respective

application".

Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments filed in the amendment received on 5/11/05 have been

fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. <u>The applicants argue that Ching does not suggest or teach **a table** in which a data object type has a respective associated record writer</u>

On the contrary, Ching discloses a hierarchy in which an object has its associated methods and parameters associated each of the methods (fig. 8). A table in a database system is well known in database art for storing records (line 4-9 in col. 4). The hierarchy in fig. 8 teaches a table, which comprises columns for objects, method, parameters, and fields and rows for records, wherein each record includes a combination of an object, a method, a parameter, and a field. Thus, the hierarchy in fig. 8 teaches a table.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ching et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,407,761) in view of Brodsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,895,472).

With respect to claim 1, Ching discloses an application layer (item 206 in fig. 2) in which, independently of one another, applications for registering data objects of various data object types into a database associated with a respective application can be executed (i.e., applications register objects in the Business Object

Repository/Database, lines 54-57 in col. 3, lines 10-21 in col. 4, and lines 43-48 in col.

5); the respective addressed application in the application layer, in response to a

registration operation, producing information about the data objects which are to be

registered (lines 43-48 in col. 5). Ching discloses a record layer which is encapsulated

with respect to the application layer and in which a number of record writers (i.e., BAPI

interface) each having a dynamic interface is implemented (fig. 5, fig. 6, and line 66 in

col. 4 thru line 29 in col. 5). Ching discloses a hierarchy, teaching a table, in which a

data object type has a respective associated record writer; the record writer associated

by means of the table being designed to access the reference and hence the

information about the data objects which are to be registered via the dynamic interface

(fig. 8, lines 40-51 in col. 4, and lines 21-29 in col. 6). Ching discloses a record registrar

(i.e., Business Object Repository/Database) for permanently storing record object data,

transferred by a record writer and comprising information about the data objects which

are to be registered (lines 30-48 in col. 5 and lines 1-29 in col. 6). Ching does not

explicitly disclose information about the registration. However, Brodsky discloses

creating a log for data manipulations (i.e., registering an object) in an object-oriented

system (lines 20-31 in col. 2 and lines 30-34 in col. 8) in order to capture changes in the

object-oriented system concerning information about the registration in a form of a

reference of prescribed structure. Therefore, based on Ching in view of Atkinson, and

further in view of Brodsky, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to utilize the log of Brodsky to the system of

Ching in order to capture changes in the object-oriented database.

With respect to claim 2, Ching teaches the record writers (BAPI interfaces) have the same dynamic interface (lines 52-65 in col. 4 and fig. 6).

With respect to claim 3, Ching discloses the record registrar (Business Object Repository/Database) is designed to produce and store a change record comprising at least some of a record object data (lines 31-48 in col. 5 and fig. 11).

With respect to claim 6, Ching discloses a management module (database management system 208 in fig. 2) in the application layer for creating, changing, or erasing a table entry (lines 10-21 in col. 4). The limitations of claim 6 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 8, Ching discloses various record writers derived from a stand record writer for a standard data object type which inherit at least one of the standard records writer's methods and/or its interface (lines 52-65 in col. 4).

With respect to claim 9, Ching discloses the record writers can be created or changed during operation of the database system (line 66 in col. 4 thru line 13 in col. 5).

With respect to claim 10, Brodsky further discloses the information comprises the data object before registration, the data after registration, the registration time and an identifier of an initiating user or a process (lines 20-31 in col. 2 and lines 30-34 in col. 8). Therefore, the limitations of claim 10 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

Claims 11-13, 16, and 18-20 are essentially the same as claims 1-3, 6, and 8-10 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a method rather than a system and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

7.   Claims 4-5 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Ching et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,407,761) in view of Brodsky et al. (U.S. Patent No.

5,895,472), as applied in claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 16, and 18-20 above, and further in view

of Gerard et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,230,311).

With respect to claim 4, Ching and Brodsky disclose the claimed subject matter

as discussed above except customizing the table. However, Gerard discloses

customizing table upstream of the table (the method table), in which customizing table it

is possible to activate writing for various data object types (abstract, lines 14-33 in col.

6, and lines 9-41 in col. 12) in order to selectively allow writing operations for various

data object types. Therefore, based on Ching in view of Brodsky, and further in view of

Gerard, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to utilize customizing the table of Gerard to the system of Ching in

order to selectively perform writing operations for various data object types.

With respect to claim 5, Gerard further discloses customizing table contains

differentiation parameters (abstract, lines 14-33 in col. 6, and lines 9-41 in col. 12).

Therefore, the limitations of claim 5 are rejected in the analysis of claim 4 above, and

the claim is rejected on that basis.

The limitations of claims 14-15 are rejected in the analysis of claims 4-5 above,

and these claims are rejected on that basis.

8.   Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Ching et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,407,761) in view of Brodsky et al. (U.S. Patent No.

5,895,472), as applied in claims 1-3, 6, 8-13, 16, and 18-20 above, and further in view

of Soderstrom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,741,982).

With respect to claim 7, Ching and Brodsky disclose the claimed subject matter

as discussed above. Ching further discloses a SAP system (lines 52-65 in col. 4).

Ching and Brodsky do not explicitly disclose a record writer implemented in a form of an

ABAP class with methods and an interface. However, Soderstrom teaches ABAP can

be used to create functions for an application in a SAP system (lines 26-57 in col. 2).

Therefore, based on Ching in view of Brodsky, and further in view of Soderstrom, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to utilize the ABAP of Soderstrom to the system of Ching for another way of

creating a function in the SAP system.

The limitations of claim 17 are rejected in the analysis of claim 7 above, and the

claim is rejected on that basis.

Conclusion

9.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Joon H. Hwang whose telephone number is 571-272-

4036. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00(M~F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, JOHN E. BREENE can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-

872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joon Hwang
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100

MOHAMMAD ALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

7/22/05